The Contemporary Revival of Natural Rights and Morality: Insights from Judging Freedom and Beyond

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

October 3, 2024

The revival of natural rights and morality in contemporary political, legal, and philosophical discourse reflects a growing concern over government overreach, individual liberty, and ethical governance. Rooted in classical natural law theory, these ideas emphasize that certain rights—such as life, liberty, and property—are inherent and inalienable, forming the basis for a just legal system. Platforms like Judge Andrew Napolitano's *Judging Freedom* have become significant in promoting these principles, featuring intellectuals who advocate for limited government, constitutional originalism, and non-interventionist foreign policies. This paper explores the contributions of key figures such as Randy Barnett, Scott Ritter, and Seymour M. Hersh, who offer diverse perspectives on the protection of natural rights in today's complex global landscape. By examining their insights, we seek to understand how natural law can address contemporary challenges, from civil liberties and judicial decision-making to international relations and governance.

Keywords: natural rights, natural law, government overreach, civil liberties, non-interventionism, constitutional originalism, Judge Andrew Napolitano, *Judging Freedom*, Randy Barnett, Scott Ritter, Seymour M. Hersh.

Note: Verbatim GPT-4o after an extensive Q & A with the author who requested real-time searches. Most of this information is not in the OpenAI training corpus.

Introduction

Brief Explanation of the Concept of Natural Rights and Morality

Natural rights and morality stem from the idea that certain rights are inherent to all individuals, independent of government or societal laws. These rights, which include life, liberty, and property, are viewed as universal and inalienable because they are derived from human nature itself. The moral aspect of this concept is grounded in natural law theory, which holds that human beings can discover objective moral truths through reason. Thinkers like John Locke and Thomas Aquinas were foundational in articulating these ideas, emphasizing that the law should align with moral principles inherent in human nature. These principles guide individuals and governments toward just actions and the protection of fundamental human rights.

Natural law contrasts with legal positivism, which asserts that laws are created by human beings and do not necessarily have to align with moral truths. In contrast, proponents of natural rights argue that laws should reflect the moral reality of human nature, protecting the inherent dignity and rights of individuals. This philosophical stance has informed centuries of democratic and human rights movements, shaping Western legal traditions.

The Resurgence of Natural Law Theory in the Modern Political and Legal Landscape

In recent years, there has been a resurgence of natural law theory, particularly in response to debates about government overreach, individual liberties, and constitutional interpretation. Legal scholars like Randy Barnett and Joel Alicea have contributed significantly to this revival, advocating for a return to natural rights as a foundation for constitutional interpretation, especially in the context of originalism. This movement calls for a reassessment of legal frameworks to ensure they protect the inalienable rights of individuals, emphasizing that laws should be rooted in objective moral principles rather than transient political agendas.

The resurgence of natural rights theory can also be seen as a response to modern relativism, where moral truths are often viewed as subjective or culturally dependent. Advocates of natural rights argue that abandoning objective moral

standards leads to an erosion of individual freedoms and social stability, as laws become disconnected from universal human dignity. This philosophical revival, therefore, reflects growing concerns about the increasing power of governments and institutions over individual liberties.

How Judging Freedom with Judge Andrew Napolitano Serves as a Platform for These Ideas

Judge Andrew Napolitano's *Judging Freedom* podcast has become an influential platform for discussing natural rights and morality, particularly through its engagement with libertarian and conservative intellectuals. Napolitano himself is a staunch advocate for natural law, often drawing on the work of classical thinkers like John Locke and Thomas Aquinas to frame his arguments against government overreach and in defense of individual liberties. He frequently explores how natural law principles can provide a moral foundation for resisting unjust laws and policies.

Through interviews with legal scholars, political commentators, and public intellectuals, *Judging Freedom* brings natural rights theory into contemporary debates. Napolitano's guests, such as Randy Barnett, Scott Ritter, Colonel Douglas Macgregor, and Seymour Hersh, often emphasize the importance of individual liberty, non-interventionism, and moral responsibility in governance. This platform allows for a rich exploration of how natural law theory can address modern political and legal challenges, such as the ethical implications of foreign intervention, surveillance, and civil liberties.

Purpose of the Paper

The purpose of this paper is to examine the key proponents of natural rights and morality, particularly those who have featured on *Judging Freedom*. By exploring the views of Napolitano and his guests, we aim to provide insight into how natural law theory is being revived and applied to contemporary political and legal issues. This paper will trace the historical roots of natural rights theory, its modern resurgence, and the specific contributions of intellectuals like Barnett, Macgregor, Sachs, and others who advocate for a return to the moral foundations of law and governance.

By doing so, we aim to highlight the relevance of natural rights and morality in addressing current global challenges, from government overreach to foreign policy, and to provide a comprehensive understanding of how these ideas are shaping modern political discourse.

Historical Context of Natural Rights and Morality

Overview of Classical Natural Law Theory: Thinkers Like John Locke, Thomas Aquinas, and Aristotle

Classical natural law theory is rooted in the idea that there exists a universal moral order that is inherent to the natural world and human beings. This moral order, accessible through reason, dictates what is right and wrong, and forms the foundation for laws that should guide human societies.

Aristotle was one of the earliest thinkers to explore this idea. He proposed that humans are social beings with natural ends, and through the exercise of reason, they can discern the principles of justice and morality. In his *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Politics*, Aristotle emphasized that the highest good for individuals and societies is found in living virtuously, according to their nature. For Aristotle, natural justice existed independently of human laws, and while man-made laws may vary between cultures, they should align with this higher natural law.

Thomas Aquinas, drawing from Aristotle, further developed the concept of natural law in the context of Christian theology. He argued that natural law is a part of divine law, given to humans through reason, allowing them to participate in God's eternal law. In Aquinas' view, natural law provides the foundation for human-made laws, which must correspond to this higher order to be just. In his work *Summa Theologica*, Aquinas laid out that all humans, by virtue of their rational nature, have the capacity to discern the basic precepts of natural law, such as the pursuit of good and avoidance of evil.

John Locke, an Enlightenment thinker, applied natural law theory to political philosophy, profoundly influencing modern democratic thought. Locke argued that natural rights are inherent to individuals and include life, liberty, and property. These rights, he believed, are derived from natural law and exist independently of government authority. In his *Two Treatises of Government*,

Locke contended that governments are formed by social contract to protect these inalienable rights, and any government that violates these rights loses its legitimacy. Locke's ideas became foundational to modern liberal democracy, particularly influencing the development of the U.S. Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

Connection Between Natural Rights and Modern Democratic Principles

The concept of natural rights has been instrumental in shaping modern democratic principles. Locke's articulation of natural rights as life, liberty, and property became the backbone of political thought that emphasized the inherent dignity and autonomy of the individual. These rights are considered inalienable, meaning they cannot be surrendered or transferred, as they are intrinsic to human nature. Locke's view that the role of government is to protect these natural rights was revolutionary in advocating for limited government, individual sovereignty, and resistance to tyranny.

The Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution are heavily influenced by Locke's ideas, particularly in their emphasis on the protection of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These documents enshrine the principle that legitimate government power is derived from the consent of the governed, and that individuals have the right to overthrow a government that infringes upon their natural rights. The influence of natural law theory is also evident in other foundational democratic texts, such as the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, which asserts that "men are born and remain free and equal in rights."

The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), established in 1948, also reflects natural rights principles, affirming that all human beings are entitled to certain rights regardless of their nationality or government. The universality and inalienability of rights in the UDHR echo the earlier natural law philosophies of Locke and Aquinas, reaffirming that these rights are inherent to all human beings.

Evolution of the Concept in Contemporary Legal Theory

In contemporary legal theory, natural rights have experienced a resurgence, particularly through scholars like Randy Barnett, who emphasize the importance

of grounding constitutional law in natural law principles. Barnett, a libertarian legal theorist and professor at Georgetown University, has written extensively on how the U.S. Constitution should be interpreted in a way that respects the natural rights of individuals. In his book *Restoring the Lost Constitution: The Presumption of Liberty*, Barnett argues that the Constitution was intended to protect individual rights from government intrusion and that laws should be presumed unconstitutional if they infringe on individual liberty without a compelling justification.

Barnett's work advocates for a return to a natural rights framework in constitutional interpretation, which prioritizes individual freedom over government authority. He contends that the judiciary should adopt a more robust role in protecting natural rights, using the Constitution as a vehicle for ensuring that the government does not overstep its bounds. His theory of constitutional originalism, which seeks to interpret the Constitution according to its original meaning, is rooted in the idea that the document was designed to preserve the natural rights of citizens.

The influence of natural law theory is also evident in the work of Robert P. George, a contemporary philosopher who teaches at Princeton University. George advocates for a natural law approach to bioethics and constitutional law, arguing that moral truths can be objectively known through reason. His work emphasizes the importance of recognizing the inherent dignity of human life, particularly in debates surrounding abortion, euthanasia, and marriage. Like Barnett, George stresses that legal systems should be aligned with moral principles derived from natural law, ensuring that individual rights are protected against the encroachment of state power.

Conclusion

The historical development of natural rights and morality, from Aristotle and Aquinas to Locke and modern legal scholars like Barnett and George, reveals a consistent emphasis on the protection of inherent human dignity and autonomy. These ideas have shaped the foundations of modern democratic systems, where governments are tasked with safeguarding the natural rights of their citizens. As contemporary debates around government overreach and individual liberties

continue to evolve, the principles of natural law remain a vital framework for ensuring justice and freedom in society.

Key Figures in the Contemporary Natural Rights Movement

Judge Andrew Napolitano: His Legal Philosophy Rooted in Libertarianism and Natural Law

Judge Andrew Napolitano is a significant proponent of natural rights and libertarian legal philosophy. His views are deeply rooted in the classical natural law tradition, which holds that individual rights such as life, liberty, and property are inherent and must be protected against government intrusion. As a former New Jersey Superior Court judge and a prominent legal analyst, Napolitano often critiques government overreach, advocating for limited government and individual sovereignty.

Napolitano believes that the U.S. Constitution is fundamentally a charter for the protection of natural rights, arguing that it places strict limits on governmental power. His interpretation of the Constitution aligns with a natural law framework, where laws are only legitimate if they respect the inherent rights of individuals. In his numerous writings, including *Constitutional Chaos* and *The Constitution in Exile*, Napolitano argues that the government consistently violates natural rights through overregulation, surveillance, and military interventionism. He champions civil liberties and opposes policies that infringe on personal freedom, such as the Patriot Act and mass surveillance programs.

Randy Barnett: A Major Intellectual Force Advocating for a Return to Natural Law Principles within Constitutional Law

Randy Barnett, a professor of law at Georgetown University, is one of the leading modern proponents of natural law within constitutional interpretation. His legal philosophy emphasizes the "presumption of liberty," which holds that individuals are naturally free, and governments must justify any infringements on personal liberty. Barnett's work, such as *Restoring the Lost Constitution*, argues that the U.S. Constitution should be interpreted as a means of protecting natural rights rather than expanding governmental authority.

Barnett's contribution to the natural rights movement lies in his advocacy for constitutional originalism—interpreting the Constitution based on its original meaning. He believes that the framers intended the Constitution to be a protector of inherent individual rights and that many contemporary legal interpretations have deviated from this principle. His scholarship is particularly influential among libertarians and conservatives who view the Constitution as a framework for preserving liberty rather than granting power to the government.

Scott Ritter and Colonel Douglas Macgregor: Perspectives on Military Intervention and Sovereignty

Scott Ritter, a former United Nations weapons inspector, and Colonel Douglas Macgregor, a retired U.S. Army colonel, contribute to the natural rights discourse through their opposition to U.S. military interventionism. Both argue that aggressive foreign policies and interventions infringe on the natural rights of individuals and nations, particularly the right to self-determination and sovereignty.

Ritter and Macgregor often emphasize the moral responsibility of nations to respect the sovereignty of others, viewing military intervention as a violation of collective and individual rights. Macgregor, in particular, critiques the U.S. military-industrial complex, arguing that perpetual war undermines both national security and the natural rights of individuals at home and abroad. They advocate for non-interventionist policies that respect the rights of nations to govern themselves without external interference, reflecting a global application of natural law principles.

Seymour M. Hersh: Investigative Work Exposing Government Overreach

Seymour Hersh is a renowned investigative journalist whose work often exposes government abuses of power, particularly in the context of war, intelligence, and civil liberties. Although not explicitly a natural rights theorist, Hersh’s work aligns with the defense of individual rights against government overreach. His investigations into events such as the My Lai Massacre during the Vietnam War and the Abu Ghraib prison scandal highlight violations of human rights and governmental disregard for the dignity and sovereignty of individuals.

Hersh's reporting consistently demonstrates the dangers of unchecked government power, reinforcing the idea that protecting individual rights—especially in wartime—requires transparency, accountability, and limitations on government authority. His commitment to revealing the truth about government misconduct places him within a broader tradition of defending natural rights through journalistic integrity.

Jeffrey D. Sachs: A Moral Approach to Economics and Foreign Policy

Jeffrey Sachs, an economist and public intellectual, brings a moral perspective to economics and global development. Sachs frequently critiques U.S. foreign policy and economic practices that prioritize power and profit over the rights and well-being of individuals, particularly in the developing world. He advocates for a just global system that respects the rights of nations and individuals, emphasizing the importance of sustainable development and poverty reduction as moral imperatives.

Sachs' approach aligns with the natural rights tradition by stressing the inherent dignity of individuals and the responsibility of governments and international institutions to protect those rights. His advocacy for economic policies that prioritize human well-being over exploitation reflects a commitment to natural rights on a global scale.

Alastair Crooke: Critique of Western Interventionism

Alastair Crooke, a former British diplomat and founder of the Conflicts Forum, is a prominent critic of Western interventionism. He argues that the imposition of Western values and political systems on other nations violates their sovereignty, a fundamental natural right of self-determination. Crooke's critique is particularly focused on the Middle East, where he contends that Western military interventions and regime change operations have led to widespread human rights violations and destabilization.

Crooke's views on national sovereignty as a collective natural right reflect a broader application of natural law principles to international relations. He advocates for a more multipolar world where nations are free to determine their own paths without external coercion or domination, aligning his critiques with the defense of natural rights at both the individual and national levels.

Conclusion

These key figures contribute to the contemporary natural rights movement through diverse perspectives, ranging from legal theory to journalism, military analysis, and economic policy. Whether through constitutional advocacy, opposition to military intervention, or investigative journalism, they share a commitment to defending the inherent rights of individuals and nations against the encroachments of government and external powers. Their work demonstrates that natural rights and morality continue to provide a critical framework for addressing modern political and legal challenges.

Philosophical and Political Implications of Natural Rights in Modern Times

The Role of Natural Law in Constitutional Theory, Originalism, and Judicial Decision-Making

Natural law plays a significant role in shaping contemporary constitutional theory, particularly through the lens of originalism. Originalism asserts that the Constitution should be interpreted according to its original meaning, with a focus on the intentions of the framers. Randy Barnett is a leading figure in this school of thought, advocating that the U.S. Constitution is fundamentally a document designed to protect natural rights. He argues that the framers intended the Constitution to limit government power and protect individual liberties, drawing on principles of natural law to argue for a "presumption of liberty" in legal cases. In Barnett's view, laws that infringe upon liberty must be justified by the government, rather than individuals having to prove the need for their freedoms.

Similarly, Judge Andrew Napolitano espouses a legal philosophy deeply rooted in natural law and libertarian principles. He argues that the Constitution's primary purpose is to safeguard the natural rights of individuals, such as life, liberty, and property. Napolitano critiques government overreach, claiming that many modern policies and laws violate these inalienable rights. Both Barnett and Napolitano believe that natural law should guide judicial decision-making, especially when it comes to interpreting the limits of governmental authority. They argue for a more restrictive view of government power, focusing on individual rights as the foundation of constitutional law.

The natural rights approach contrasts with legal positivism, where laws are seen as constructs of the state and need not align with moral principles. Natural law theorists argue that judicial decisions should reflect inherent moral truths that exist independently of human-made laws, thus promoting a legal system that preserves and protects individual rights as part of the natural order.

Non-Interventionism in Foreign Policy: Grounding in Natural Rights and Moral Sovereignty

Natural rights theory extends beyond domestic legal frameworks into the realm of international relations, particularly through the principle of non-interventionism. Figures like Scott Ritter, Colonel Douglas Macgregor, and Alastair Crooke emphasize that military interventions by powerful states violate the natural rights of nations and individuals, particularly the right to self-determination. They argue that every nation, like every individual, has the inherent right to govern itself without external interference, a view that aligns with the principle of moral sovereignty.

Scott Ritter and Colonel Douglas Macgregor highlight the destructive consequences of U.S. military interventions, particularly in the Middle East. They argue that these interventions often violate the sovereignty of nations and undermine the natural rights of individuals caught in the crossfire. By emphasizing the need for non-interventionist policies, they advocate for a foreign policy grounded in respect for natural rights, where the sovereignty of nations is seen as an extension of the rights of individuals to govern their own lives free from external domination.

Alastair Crooke takes a similar stance, critiquing Western interventions in the Middle East as morally unjust and counterproductive. He argues that imposing Western political values and systems on other cultures violates their natural right to self-determination and leads to instability. Crooke's critique is rooted in the belief that natural law applies not only to individuals but to nations, and that each nation has a right to choose its own path without coercion. This perspective ties into a broader application of natural rights theory, where moral sovereignty and non-intervention are seen as fundamental to a just global order.

The Ethical Critique of Government Overreach in Journalism

Investigative journalism often serves as a critical check on government power, exposing violations of natural rights and civil liberties. Seymour M. Hersh, a renowned investigative journalist, has built his career on uncovering government abuses, particularly in the context of war, intelligence operations, and civil liberties. His work aligns with the ethical critique of government overreach, focusing on how the state often infringes upon the rights of individuals in the pursuit of power or secrecy.

Hersh's investigations, such as his exposé on the My Lai Massacre during the Vietnam War and the Abu Ghraib prison abuses during the Iraq War, highlight how government actions can lead to serious violations of natural rights. His reporting on these events emphasizes the importance of transparency and accountability, which are necessary to protect the public's right to truth. Hersh's work illustrates the moral obligation of the press to defend individual rights by exposing government misconduct, making him a key figure in the fight against unchecked power.

In a natural rights framework, government power is legitimate only insofar as it protects individual liberties. When the state oversteps its bounds—through mass surveillance, unjust wars, or suppression of dissent—it violates the natural rights of its citizens. Journalists like Hersh play a crucial role in upholding these rights by holding governments accountable for their actions, thereby reinforcing the importance of free speech and public access to information as extensions of natural law.

Conclusion

In modern times, the philosophical and political implications of natural rights remain highly relevant, shaping debates around constitutional interpretation, foreign policy, and governmental accountability. Legal scholars like Randy Barnett and Judge Napolitano argue that the protection of individual liberties must remain central to constitutional law, while figures like Scott Ritter, Douglas Macgregor, and Alastair Crooke extend these principles to international relations, advocating for the sovereignty of nations and the non-interventionist approach. Investigative journalism, exemplified by Seymour Hersh, continues to act as a vital force in defending natural rights by exposing violations of civil liberties and

ensuring public transparency. Together, these perspectives underscore the enduring significance of natural rights theory in addressing contemporary legal, political, and ethical challenges.

Challenges and Criticisms

Legal Positivism and Its Challenge to Natural Law

One of the most significant challenges to natural law theory comes from legal positivism, a dominant philosophy in modern legal theory. Legal positivists argue that law is a construct of human societies and does not need to be grounded in moral or natural principles. According to legal positivism, laws are valid simply because they are enacted by legitimate authority, regardless of their alignment with moral or natural rights. This view, championed by figures such as H.L.A. Hart and John Austin, separates law from morality, arguing that the legitimacy of law stems from social rules and procedures rather than universal moral truths.

Legal positivism poses a direct challenge to natural law by rejecting the notion that laws must reflect objective moral standards. For positivists, laws may be unjust or morally questionable, but their validity is determined by their source, not their content. This divergence is critical in judicial interpretation, where legal positivists tend to focus on the letter of the law rather than any inherent moral foundation. Natural law theorists, in contrast, argue that without a moral underpinning, laws can become instruments of tyranny, legitimizing oppressive practices without ethical recourse.

The debate between natural law and legal positivism is particularly relevant in contemporary legal discourse, especially in cases involving civil liberties. For example, natural law theorists might argue that certain government policies—such as mass surveillance—are inherently unjust because they violate the natural right to privacy, whereas legal positivists may defend these policies based on their legality under existing statutes.

Critics of Natural Law Philosophy: Moral Relativism and Cultural Diversity

Another major criticism of natural law comes from advocates of moral relativism and those who emphasize cultural diversity. Critics argue that natural law, with its

assertion of universal moral truths, fails to account for the vast diversity of moral beliefs and practices across different cultures and societies. Moral relativists maintain that what is considered "right" or "just" varies greatly depending on cultural, historical, and social contexts, and that it is impossible to assert a single, universal set of moral principles applicable to all human beings.

From this perspective, natural law is seen as overly prescriptive and culturally imperialistic, imposing a particular set of moral values (often based on Western philosophical traditions) onto societies with different ethical frameworks. This critique is particularly relevant in the context of global human rights, where the imposition of certain rights—such as individual liberty or private property—may conflict with communal or collectivist values held by other cultures. Critics argue that natural law's emphasis on individual rights often overlooks these collective ethical systems, leading to tensions in international law and human rights discourse.

In addition, postmodern philosophers and cultural anthropologists critique natural law for its assumption of a static, unchanging human nature. They argue that human nature is fluid and shaped by social, economic, and historical forces, and that moral systems must evolve to reflect these changes. This perspective challenges the foundational natural law principle that human beings have inherent, universal rights based on their nature.

Political Polarization Surrounding Natural Rights in Contemporary Discourse

In contemporary political discourse, the concept of natural rights has become highly politicized, particularly as it intersects with libertarian and conservative ideologies. While natural rights theory historically informed both liberal and conservative political movements, it has increasingly been associated with libertarian thought, particularly in the United States, where it is often invoked to justify limited government, free markets, and individual autonomy.

This association has led to tensions, especially in debates over issues such as government regulation, healthcare, and economic policy. Libertarians argue that natural rights protect individuals from government interference, advocating for minimal state involvement in personal and economic affairs. They contend that government programs, such as social welfare or environmental regulations, often infringe on individuals' natural rights to property and personal freedom. This

interpretation aligns with the work of thinkers like Randy Barnett, who view the Constitution as a safeguard against government overreach.

Conversely, many progressives and left-leaning critics argue that this version of natural rights prioritizes individual liberty at the expense of social justice and collective welfare. They contend that a focus on property rights and individual autonomy often leads to economic inequality and the neglect of communal responsibilities. This polarization is evident in debates over healthcare, where libertarians argue that individuals have the right to make their own choices free from government mandates, while progressives emphasize the moral duty of the state to ensure access to healthcare as a basic human right.

The political polarization surrounding natural rights is further complicated by issues such as gun control, abortion, and free speech. In the U.S., natural rights are often invoked by both sides of these debates, with conservatives frequently arguing for the right to bear arms and free speech, while liberals focus on the protection of life and the need for speech regulation in the context of hate speech or misinformation. This divergence illustrates the difficulty of applying natural rights theory in a politically polarized environment, where different groups prioritize different aspects of what they consider "natural" or "inalienable" rights.

Conclusion

The challenges and criticisms of natural law and natural rights theory are multifaceted, stemming from philosophical, cultural, and political perspectives. Legal positivism directly contests the moral foundations of natural law, emphasizing the legality of laws rather than their moral content. Critics from the moral relativist camp argue that natural law fails to account for cultural diversity, while political polarization has led to divergent interpretations of natural rights across ideological lines. Despite these challenges, the natural rights framework continues to influence debates around individual liberty, government authority, and global justice, making it a vital component of modern political and legal thought.

The Role of Media Platforms like *Judging Freedom* in Promoting Natural Rights

How Judging Freedom Has Become a Significant Platform for Discussing These Ideas

Judging Freedom, hosted by Judge Andrew Napolitano, has emerged as a key platform for the exploration of natural rights, libertarian principles, and limited government. In an age where mainstream media often emphasizes the role of government in solving societal problems, *Judging Freedom* provides a counter-narrative rooted in classical liberalism and the defense of inherent individual rights. The podcast features in-depth discussions with scholars, former military officials, journalists, and public intellectuals, focusing on the philosophical and practical implications of natural law in modern governance.

The podcast regularly addresses themes of personal freedom, government overreach, and the moral basis of law, providing an accessible space for the public to engage with complex legal and political theories. Napolitano, through his own legal background and libertarian leanings, curates a variety of perspectives that highlight the importance of safeguarding natural rights against the expansion of state power. *Judging Freedom* acts as a forum where ideas about personal liberty, sovereignty, and the ethics of governance are openly debated and explored, giving natural law theory renewed relevance in today's political landscape.

The Intersection of Media, Public Intellectualism, and Activism in Reviving Natural Rights Theories

In the contemporary media environment, platforms like *Judging Freedom* bridge the gap between public intellectualism and activism. Napolitano's podcast does more than disseminate theoretical discussions; it serves as a call to action for individuals concerned about the erosion of their natural rights. By featuring prominent libertarian thinkers, former military leaders, and investigative journalists, the platform galvanizes a movement toward the protection of civil liberties and constitutional principles rooted in natural law.

The intersection of media and public intellectualism is evident in the show's format, which allows for deep discussions on issues such as constitutional originalism, non-interventionist foreign policy, and the ethics of governmental transparency. Figures like Randy Barnett and Colonel Douglas Macgregor provide

insights into how natural law theory informs legal and foreign policy decisions, while investigative journalists like Seymour M. Hersh highlight the dangers of unchecked governmental power. This convergence of intellectual rigor and media outreach ensures that complex legal and moral concepts are accessible to a broader audience, thereby reviving interest in natural rights theories and their application to current events.

Moreover, the platform encourages a form of activism based on awareness and education. By exposing listeners to critiques of government interventionism and legal positivism, *Judging Freedom* fosters a community of listeners who are not only informed but also motivated to challenge governmental overreach and advocate for the protection of their liberties. Napolitano's regular emphasis on the Constitution as a protector of natural rights and his discussions on topics like civil liberties and state surveillance directly tie media activism to philosophical and legal debates.

Napolitano's Guests as Key Voices in an Ongoing Dialogue About Morality, Law, and Governance

The guests on *Judging Freedom* play a crucial role in shaping the program's discourse on natural rights and morality. Figures such as Randy Barnett, Scott Ritter, Colonel Douglas Macgregor, Seymour M. Hersh, and Jeffrey D. Sachs bring a variety of perspectives to the show, enriching the discussion around natural law, individual liberty, and moral governance. Each guest contributes unique insights into how natural rights apply across different domains, from constitutional law and foreign policy to economic justice and civil liberties.

- Randy Barnett is a frequent guest, providing expertise on constitutional originalism and advocating for a return to natural law principles in judicial interpretation. His discussions with Napolitano emphasize the need to protect individual liberties from governmental infringement, particularly through the courts.
- Scott Ritter and Colonel Douglas Macgregor offer perspectives on military intervention and national sovereignty, tying these concepts back to the natural rights of nations and individuals. Their critique of U.S. foreign policy aligns with non-interventionist values, which they argue are rooted in respect for the inherent dignity and rights of other nations.

- Seymour M. Hersh, through his investigative journalism, exposes how violations of civil liberties and governmental overreach undermine natural rights. His discussions on *Judging Freedom* often focus on the ethical implications of government secrecy and the role of the press in protecting public transparency.
- Jeffrey D. Sachs, an economist and public intellectual, brings a moral lens to discussions of economics and foreign policy, stressing the importance of international justice and the protection of human rights in global governance. His appearances on the podcast highlight how natural law can inform ethical approaches to economic development and diplomacy.

These voices collectively advance the conversation about the relevance of natural rights in modern governance. By engaging with both the philosophical foundations and practical applications of natural law, Napolitano's guests ensure that the dialogue on *Judging Freedom* remains a vital contribution to contemporary political and legal discourse.

Conclusion

Judging Freedom has emerged as an essential platform for promoting and discussing natural rights and morality in the modern era. Through its intersection of media, public intellectualism, and activism, the podcast encourages a deeper understanding of how natural law principles can address contemporary challenges. Napolitano's guests, from legal scholars to investigative journalists, contribute diverse perspectives that enrich the ongoing debate about the role of morality in law and governance. Together, these discussions help revive interest in natural law theory and its application to current political and ethical issues, fostering a more informed and engaged public.

Conclusion

The Relevance of Natural Rights and Morality in Today's Political, Legal, and Philosophical Discussions

Natural rights and morality remain highly relevant in contemporary political, legal, and philosophical discussions, as they provide a framework for evaluating the

legitimacy of laws and government actions. In an era where concerns about state overreach, civil liberties, and individual autonomy are increasingly pressing, natural law offers a counterbalance to legal positivism and relativism. It asserts that certain rights—such as life, liberty, and property—are inherent and cannot be infringed by the state, regardless of legal constructs or cultural differences. These principles resonate in current debates surrounding privacy, freedom of speech, and government intervention, particularly as technologies like mass surveillance and data collection continue to evolve.

Moreover, natural law's emphasis on objective moral truths provides a critical lens through which to examine the ethical dimensions of government policies. Issues such as healthcare, economic inequality, and environmental sustainability are being reassessed in light of whether they uphold or undermine natural rights. This philosophical grounding is also central to discussions about global justice and human rights, particularly in contexts where oppressive regimes and unjust laws persist. By asserting that these rights are universal, natural law advocates push back against relativism and seek to create a more just international order.

Final Reflections on the Contributions of Napolitano's Guests to the Natural Rights Discourse

The contributions of Judge Andrew Napolitano's guests on *Judging Freedom* have been pivotal in advancing the natural rights discourse. Randy Barnett, through his advocacy of originalism and natural law in constitutional interpretation, has reinforced the idea that the U.S. Constitution is a bulwark for protecting individual liberties against governmental intrusion. His calls for a return to the original meaning of the Constitution align with the natural law principle that laws must respect the inalienable rights of individuals.

Scott Ritter and Colonel Douglas Macgregor extend these principles into the realm of foreign policy, arguing that non-interventionism respects the natural rights of nations and individuals to self-determination. Their critique of military intervention as a violation of sovereignty resonates with natural law's emphasis on moral sovereignty and the right to be free from external domination. Meanwhile, Seymour M. Hersh's investigative work exposing government overreach and abuses of power contributes to the defense of civil liberties, which are central to the protection of natural rights in any society.

The diversity of perspectives brought by Napolitano's guests, from legal theory and military strategy to journalism and economics, reflects the breadth of natural rights discourse and its application to various fields. By exploring these different dimensions, *Judging Freedom* has become a critical platform for discussing how natural law theory informs not only domestic law but also foreign policy, governance, and ethics in journalism.

The Future of Natural Law in Addressing Contemporary Global Challenges

Looking forward, natural law theory is poised to play an important role in addressing contemporary global challenges. As technology continues to advance and issues like data privacy, artificial intelligence, and biotechnology take center stage, the need for ethical frameworks that protect individual rights will grow. Natural law, with its emphasis on inherent human dignity and autonomy, offers a robust moral foundation for guiding policy decisions in these areas. For instance, debates over data ownership and privacy can be grounded in the natural right to personal autonomy and the protection of one's private sphere.

In the realm of international relations, natural law principles will be crucial in advocating for the sovereignty of nations and the rights of individuals in a rapidly changing global order. The rise of authoritarian regimes and ongoing conflicts underscore the importance of a global framework that respects natural rights. Non-interventionist policies, grounded in the respect for national sovereignty and self-determination, can help mitigate conflicts and promote a more peaceful international order.

Finally, the resurgence of natural law within constitutional interpretation, as advocated by figures like Barnett, will likely continue to influence judicial decision-making. As courts grapple with issues related to freedom of speech, religious liberty, and government surveillance, natural law provides a timeless foundation for interpreting laws in a way that protects individual rights. In an increasingly polarized political landscape, natural law offers a unifying principle that transcends party lines by focusing on universal human rights and the moral obligations of government.

In conclusion, natural law and natural rights remain powerful tools for analyzing and addressing the ethical and legal challenges of the modern world. Through platforms like *Judging Freedom*, these ideas are being revitalized and applied to

contemporary debates, ensuring that the protection of inherent human rights continues to be a guiding force in political and legal thought.

References

Barnett, Randy. *Restoring the Lost Constitution: The Presumption of Liberty*. Princeton University Press, 2014.

Hersh, Seymour M. "Seymour Hersh on the Massacre at My Lai." *The New Yorker*, March 14, 1972. Available at: New Yorker Archives.

Napolitano, Andrew P. *Constitutional Chaos: What Happens When the Government Breaks Its Own Laws*. Thomas Nelson, 2006.

Napolitano, Andrew P. *The Constitution in Exile: How the Federal Government Has Seized Power by Rewriting the Supreme Law of the Land*. Thomas Nelson, 2007.

Ritter, Scott, and Douglas Macgregor. "The Ethical Implications of U.S. Foreign Policy and Military Interventionism." *Judging Freedom* podcast, hosted by Judge Andrew Napolitano. Available at: Judging Freedom YouTube Channel.

Sachs, Jeffrey D. *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time*. Penguin Books, 2006.

Crooke, Alastair. *Resistance: The Essence of the Islamist Revolution*. Pluto Press, 2009.